

IV. Claims 7 and 8, drawn to a liquid crystal display with anti-reflection or anti-glare means, classified in class 349, subclass 137.

V. Claims 25-27 and 38-41, drawn to a liquid crystal display with index-matched pressure sensitive adhesive or index-matched optical bonding material, classified in class 349, subclass 122.

VI. Claims 52-54, drawn to a liquid crystal display with a touch panel, classified in class 349, subclass 23.

VII. Claims 31-33, 42 and 46, drawn to a liquid crystal display comprising the elements of inventions I and V.

VIII. Claims 9, 28, 34-36, 43 and 44, drawn to a liquid crystal display comprising the elements of inventions IV and V.

IX. Claims 19 and 20, drawn to a liquid crystal display comprising the elements of inventions II and III.

X. Claim 21, drawn to a liquid crystal display comprising the elements of inventions II, III and V.

XI. Claims 22-24, drawn to a liquid crystal display comprising the elements of inventions II, III, IV and V.

XII. Claim 30, drawn to a liquid crystal display comprising the elements of inventions V and VI.

XIII. Claim 37, drawn to a liquid crystal display comprising the elements of inventions I, V and VI.

Currently, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 11, 12, 15 and 16 appear generic.

In response to the foregoing requirement, Applicants respectfully elect, with traverse, Group V, claims 25-27 and 38-41. The foregoing election is made with traverse for the reason that the Patent Office has not established that there would be a serious burden on the Patent Office if restriction were not required. MPEP § 803 provides that, for restriction to be proper, the Patent Office must establish **both** (i) that the inventions are independent or distinct and (ii) that there is a

serious burden on the examiner requiring restriction. Applicant submits that, in view of the fact that substantially identical claims were presented and searched in a counterpart PCT application, namely, PCT Application No. PCT/US02/02545, the burden on the examiner to search the present claims would not be serious. This paper is not to be construed as an admission that the inventions are not independent or distinct.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this paper that are not accounted for, the Examiner is authorized to charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 11-1755. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 that is not accounted for already, such an extension of time is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Kriegsman & Kriegsman

By: 

Edward M. Kriegsman
Reg. No. 33,529
665 Franklin Street
Framingham, MA 01702
(508) 879-3500

Dated: April 10, 2003

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Box Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on April 10, 2003



Edward M. Kriegsman
Reg. No. 33,529

Dated: April 10, 2003